Comment on "New analytic solution of Schrödinger's equation"

Alexander Moroz

Wave-scattering.com

arXiv:1510.04669v1 [quant-ph] 15 Oct 2015

PACS 03.65.-w – Quantum mechanics

Abstract –*** Missing author ***

A great deal of our understanding of tunneling and many other important physics phenomena and devices comes from the standard JWKB method. Therefore, any improvement of the JWKB method, such as that reported by Eleuch et al [1], may have far reaching applications. It is well known that formal substitution of the wave function $\Psi = e^{\phi(x)}$ with $\phi(x) = (i/\hbar)\int_{x_0}^{x} f(y)\,dy$ into the Schrödinger equation (SE) with a potential U,

$$\Psi'' + \frac{2m}{\hbar^2}(E-U)\Psi = 0, \tag{1}$$

yields the Riccati equation [2,3]

$$-i\hbar f'(x) + f^2(x) = p^2(x). \tag{2}$$

Here $p(x) = \sqrt{2m(E-U)}$ is the classical momentum, m is mass, E is energy, and $\hbar$ is the Planck constant. If one substitutes $f(x) = f_0(x) + \eta(x)$ into eq. (2), assuming $\eta(x)$ to be a correction, the leading order satisfies the usual JWKB condition $f_0^2(x) = p^2$. Hence the first-order contribution to $\phi(x)$ is $\phi_0(x) = (i/\hbar)\int_{x_0}^{x} p(y)\,dy = (i/\hbar)S$ involving the classical action S. For the correction $\eta(x)$ one arrives at

$$-i\hbar\eta'(x) - i\hbar p'(x) + 2p(x)\eta(x) + \eta^2(x) = 0. \tag{3}$$

On solving the equation *iteratively* by expansion into powers of $\hbar$, the next-to-leading order contribution $\phi_1 = \ln(p/\hbar)^{-1/2}$ leads to the standard JWKB approximation,

$$\Psi_{\rm JWKB}(x) \sim k^{-1/2}(x)\exp\left(i\int_{x_0}^{x} k(x)\,dx\right), \tag{4}$$

where $k = p/\hbar$ is the wave vector. The other linearly independent solution is obtained by choosing the wave vector k with a *minus* sign.

The novelty of the approach by Eleuch et al [1] is to determine the next-to-leading order contribution differently: not iteratively but as a closed analytic solution of a *linearized* equation (3) without the quadratic term $\eta^2(x)$. Remarkably, such a closed analytic solution comprises the full next-to-leading contribution of the JWKB method and, at least partially, the contributions of *all* higher orders were eq. (3) solved iteratively [1]. The closed analytic solution is thus a partial sum of an infinite asymptotic series.

The linearized equation was written in two alternative forms [*cf.* eqs. (17) and (32) of [1] in a slightly different notation]

$$\begin{aligned} &-i\hbar\eta'(x) - i\hbar p'(x) + 2p(x)\eta(x) = \\ &-i\hbar f'(x) + 2p(x)[f(x) - p(x)] = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Being first-order ordinary differential equations, their general solution contains an *arbitrary* integration constant. The most general solution to the first of eqs. (5) is

$$\eta(x) = -\int_{x_0}^{x} [p'(y) + C_1]\, e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar}[S(y)-S(x)]}\,dy, \tag{6}$$

where C_1 is such an integration constant. Analogously, the most general solution to the second of eqs. (5) is

$$f(x) = \frac{2i}{\hbar}\, e^{-\frac{2i}{\hbar}S(x)}\left(C_2 + \int_{x_0}^{x} p^2(y)\, e^{\frac{2i}{\hbar}S(y)}\,dy\right). \tag{7}$$

One assumes here $S(x_0) = 0$, or that the lower limit in the integral defining the action S is x_0. The respective constants can be fixed by the requirement that $\Psi(x) \sim \exp(\frac{i}{\hbar}S)$ in the region with $p' \equiv 0$. The latter requires $C_1 = 0$ in eq. (6) and $C_2 = \frac{\hbar}{2i}p(x_0)$ in eq. (7).

Our *first* observation is that eqs. (8) and (34) of ref. [1] are equivalent, which can be demonstrated by integration by parts, only under the above choice of integration constants. The integration constants were omitted in refs. [1, 4] and the solution (7) with $C_2 = 0$ was suggested to be applied to the case of a *step* potential. However, the integral in (7) contributes to $f(x)$ an *unphysical* term

$-p\exp[-2ik(x-x_0)]$ in any $p'=0$ region. The unphysical term cancels out only with the correct choice of C_2. Furthermore, an exponentiation of the integral of the rhs of eq. (35) of [1] cannot yield the final result of eq. (36).

Our *second* observation is that the improved JWKB method *cannot* be demonstrated in the case of a step potential. In any region with a *constant* momentum, and hence $p'(x)\equiv 0$, the two linearly independent *exact* solutions $\exp(\pm ik_j r)$ of the SE (1) are *fully* reproduced by both the standard and improved JWKB approximations. In the latter case this is exemplified in that the correction $\eta(x)$ given by eq. (6) with $C_1=0$ vanishes in the regions where $p'\equiv 0$. Hence an improved JWKB *cannot* provide anything new for a step potential or a *rectangular potential barrier*, because then $p'=0$, and hence $\eta=0$, everywhere, except for the step. Obviously, by performing a proper analysis of the *step* potential by requiring the continuity of logarithmic derivatives of $\Psi(x)$ given by eq. (37) of ref. [1] across the barrier step there *cannot* be any difference between, on one hand, solving the SE exactly and, on the other hand, by making use of either standard or improved JWKB method (because $\eta(x)\equiv 0$ before and after the step). Consequently, the results plotted in fig. 4 of ref. [1] are a mere artifact of an improper treatment of the step potential. Eqs. (16) of a follow up [4] of two of the authors suggest that a counter-propagating reflected plane wave was disregarded on both sides of the step.

Analytically, the above conclusions are supported by looking at the equations which *exact* solutions are given SE approximations [2]. $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}$ of the JWKB method satisfies

$$\Psi''(x)+[k^2(x)+W(x)]\,\Psi(x)=0, \qquad (8)$$

with an "*error*" function W [*cf.* the SE (1)] given by

$$W_{\rm JWKB}(x)=\frac{3[k'(x)]^2}{4k^2(x)}-\frac{k''(x)}{2k(x)}=-\frac{1}{2}\{S,x\}=\frac{T''}{T},$$

where $\{S,x\}$ is the *Schwarzian derivative* of $S(x)$ and $T=S'^{-1/2}=k^{-1/2}(x)$ [2]. Because $W_{\rm JWKB}$ *diverges* for $k\to 0$, each turning point is a *singular* point of the differential equation (8). This is the very reason why the JWKB solutions $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}(x)$ of eq. (4) are branches of a *multivalued* function in the proximity of a turning point and the so-called *connection formulas* are required to determine a solution on both sides of the turning point. There are the turning points where one should look for improvements over the JWKB method.

The approximation of Eleuch et al [1] is found to be *exact* solution of eq. (8) with $W=\eta^2/\hbar^2$. Obviously, $W\equiv 0$ in any $p'=0$ region (*cf.* the step potential). In general eq. (6) implies that $|\eta(x)|\le\int_{x_0}^{x}|p'(y)|\,dy$. Assuming a finite integration range and not pathologically oscillating $p'(x)$, $\eta(x)$ should be *bounded* for any bounded $p(x)$. This brings about a significant improvement over the JWKB method, because turning points now become *regular* points of the differential equation (8). Consequently, there is no longer a catastrophic failure of the improved approximation around turning points. Solutions of eq. (8) yield a good approximation to the solutions of the SE (1) whenever $|W|\ll|k^2(x)|$. Because W is *not* guaranteed to go to zero for $k(x)\to 0$ for the approximation of Eleuch et al [1], turning points may still cause some problems. A quantitative assessment of the deviation at turning points remains an open problem.

Thirdly, the improved JWKB method by Eleuch et al [1] does not in general conserve probability for a real p. One has

$$-\frac{i\hbar}{2m}\frac{d}{dx}\left(\Psi^*\frac{d\Psi}{dx}-\frac{d\Psi^*}{dx}\Psi\right)=\frac{i(\eta^2-\eta^{*2})}{2m\hbar}\,|\Psi|^2,$$

which is valid also for imaginary p. In arriving at the result we have used that $f'=-\frac{2i}{\hbar}\,p\eta$ and $p^2=p^{*2}$. Hence the probability is conserved if and only if $\eta^2=\eta^{*2}$ (*e.g.* in the region where $p'\equiv 0$). The conservation is obviously *violated* in the generic case when $\eta\neq 0$ is neither real nor purely imaginary. Although the violation should be kept in mind when applying the approximation to real problems, it need not to be necessarily a serious issue. This is because the improved JWKB approximation comprises the first two iteration orders yielding $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}$ of the JWKB method. However $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}$ conserves probability if the action S is *real*. Therefore, any violation of the probability conservation can affect only higher orders.

To put the work by Eleuch et al [1] into perspective, the method of *comparison* equations yields approximations which (i) do conserve probability and (ii) the error function W in eq. (8) goes to zero for $p\to 0$ [2,3]. However, the latter are specially designed for the crossing of turning points. They involve typically *transcendental* (*e.g.* Bessel and parabolic cylinder) functions of argument $S/\hbar$ and of the order determined by the order of a turning point [2,3]. They reduce to $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}(x)$ in the regions where $p'\equiv 0$ only for $|S/\hbar|\to\infty$. Hence the simplicity of performing various integrals with an exponential function as in the standard and improved JWKB methods is lost. Therefore, the approximation by Eleuch et al [1] may be a useful compromise between $\Psi_{\rm JWKB}(x)$ and the method of *comparison* equations [2,3]. It remains to be seen if it justifies the above expectations. The preliminary results for the energies above different barriers are promissing [1].

* * *

Continuous support of MAKM is largely acknowledged.

REFERENCES

[1] Eleuch H., Rostovtsev Y. V. and Scully M. O., EPL, **89** (2010) 50004.
[2] Langer R. E., Phys. Rev., **51** (1937) 669.
[3] Miller, Jr., S. C. and Good, Jr., R. H., Phys. Rev., **91** (1953) 174.
[4] Eleuch H. and Rostovtsev Y. V., J. Mod. Opt., **57** (2010) 1877.